



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. 08/912,757	FILING DATE 08/15/97	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CALLAN	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. SVH-08358-1
-------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------

LM01/0802

PATENT ADMINISTRATOR
TESTA HURWITZ & THIBEAULT
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON MA 02110

HAVAN EXAMINER

ART UNIT 3771	PAPER NUMBER
------------------	--------------

08/02/99⁹

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/912,757

Applicant(s)

Callan

Examiner

Thu-Thao Havan

Group Art Unit

2771



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 18, 1997

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire Three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2771

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed May 17, 1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As addressed below, Barr anticipated the amendment.

A. Barr teaches a document filtering system when he discloses “the document records have text information fields associated therewith, each of the text information fields representing text from one of the plurality of textual documents” (**column 3, lines 63-67; column 4, lines 1-8; column 2, lines 23-24**).

B. Barr teaches a document parser indicated that provides an inverted list of term contained in the documents as they are received when he discloses “a search result list having entries representative of both textual documents and multi-media files related to the single search query is generated in accordance with the document records and the multi-media records identified by the index database search” (**column 4, lines 19-23; column 4, lines 48-58; fig 2, 3, and 5a**).

C. Barr teaches an apparatus programmed to filter documents using recursive inference when he discloses “entry into the document retrieval state and the recursive query state may occur only after query server has processed a search query for the user station and returned a valid search results list for the search query to session server” (**column 21, lines 50-58; fig. 6A**).

Art Unit: 2771

Drawings

3. The drawings in this application are objected to by the Draftsperson as informal. Any drawing corrections requested but not made in the prior application should be repeated in this application if such changes are still desired. If the drawings were changed and approved during the prosecution of the prior application, a petition may be filed under 37 CFR 1.182 requesting the transfer of such drawings, provided the parent application has been abandoned. However, a copy of the drawings as originally filed must be included in the 37 CFR 1.60 application papers to indicate the original content.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. This maintains the rejection of the prior action which is hereby incorporated by reference.

6. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barr et al. (US Patent No.5,742,816).

7. As to claim 1, the prior art Barr discloses: a.) a document parser (**column 1, lines 20-27; figure 2**), b.) a profile parser (**column 1, lines 27-35; column 2, lines 20-25**), and c.) a comparator (**column 1, lines 50-55**).

Art Unit: 2771

8. As to claim 7, Barr discloses: a.) an incoming document (**column 12, lines 15-35**), b.) the produced invert list to retrieve query (**column 12, lines 12-35**), c.) a query net matching (**column 13, lines 30-67**) and d.) a scoring profile (**column 13, lines 30-67**).

9. The limitations of claim 12 have been discussed in the rejection of claims 1 and 7. They are therefore rejected as set forth above.

10. As to claim 2, Barr discloses a term dictionary (**column 12, lines 15-45**).

11. As to claim 3, Barr discloses a profile parser (**column 12, lines 54-65**).

12. As to claim 4, Barr discloses a comparator compares an inverted list (**column 13, lines 10-20**).

13. As to claim 5, Barr discloses an inverted list associated with an incoming document (**column 4, lines 19-30**).

14. As to claim 6, Barr discloses the document parser and the comparator reside on separate machines (**column 11, lines 35-50**).

15. As to claims 8 and 13, Barr discloses the step of receiving user queries and parsing the user queries to produce query nets representing the query (**column 12, lines 15-35**).

16. As to claims 9 and 14, Barr discloses the storing of all query nets associated with a user as a clipset(**column 6, lines 1-5**).

17. As to claims 10 and 15, Barr discloses the storing of an inverted list associated with incoming document (**column 6, lines 5-25**).

Art Unit: 2771

18. The limitations of claims 11 and 16 have been discussed in the rejection of claims 1 and 7. They are therefore rejected as set forth above.

Conclusion

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

21. Husick et al., US Patent 5,717,914 is considered relevant because it disclosed a method for storing input information in an information retrieval system database.

Art Unit: 2771

22. Schultz., US Patent 5,737,734 is considered relevant because it disclosed a query having at least one query word with a query word weight.

23. Turtle et al., US Patent 5,488,725 is considered relevant because it disclosed an information retrieval system based on probabilities that documents meet information needs.

Inquiries

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ms. Thu-Thao Havan whose telephone number is (703) 308-7062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black, can be reached on (703) 305-9707.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Serial Number: 08/912,757

Page 7

Art Unit: 2771

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 305-9731 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-9600.

Thu-Thao Havan

July 29, 1999


WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER